



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

hood," is still more doubtful. How can the writer assert, in view of Ex. 21:2, 7; Lev. 25:44, that "alone among the Semitic peoples, ancient or modern, Israel has left no recorded traces of a traffic in the bodies of men, except in its prohibition"? Much may be said in behalf of the amelioration of the lot of the slave among the Hebrews, but nothing is gained by exaggeration.

But we must close our observations on this thoughtful and instructive discussion. It is so suggestive and admirable that one wishes it were better. The author has not yet given us his critical analysis of the documents of the Old Testament, and without that we cannot judge of his results; he has often failed in careful distinction of historical periods, and hence has given often no clear idea of the development of institutions. He is possessed with the idea of the singularity, the uniqueness of Hebrew social life; and yet every page of his discussion reveals how in these respects the Hebrews were one with the Semitic peoples around them. Happily he could not overstate the moral grandeur of the Old Testament teachings in their highest ranges, and he has borne glowing testimony to their value for the life of today. In this all will gladly follow him and will rejoice to hail so puissant an advocate of the restoration of the Old Testament to its rightful place as an unequaled teacher of social and political morality.

GEORGE S. GOODSPED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

GESCHICHTE DES VOLKES ISRAEL, bis zur Restauration unter Esra und Nehemia. Von AUGUST KLOSTERMANN, DR. THEOL., ord. Professor an der Universität Kiel. München: Beck, 1896. Pp. xii+271. M. 4.50.

IT is difficult to assign Professor Klostermann a position among the various schools of Old Testament study. In textual criticism his emendations are bold almost to rashness. He has vigorously attacked the modern critical schools, yet has his own theory of pentateuchal criticism. Individuality is always interesting, and, if not carried to eccentricity, may do valuable service in stirring up old questions and compelling established views or authoritative dogmas to justify themselves afresh at the bar of a vigorous and original criticism. So Professor Klostermann may be trusted to give in this history something new and worth considering.

The title suggests Professor Stade's work on the same subject, but

anything more opposed in method and result could hardly be imagined. The one employs all the resources furnished by auxiliary sciences, anthropology, Assyriology, geography, etc. But the professor at Kiel is writing a history of the Old Testament church on the basis of the documents which that church has produced, and, hence, does not regard it as his province to interpret or correct those contributions by light from without. Indeed, he goes so far as to hold that it is of little value to employ the material of the Old Testament not strictly historical, such as the prophecies or the Psalms, for the purposes of historical elucidation. One has, according to him, a great historical work or series of works in the biblical books Genesis to Nehemiah, and these must be the real source of our knowledge. Criticism on the part of the Old Testament church has already done its work in producing those books, and we are but far-distant and dimly discerning followers. There are, indeed, certain branches of critical work which still remain open to us to be exercised upon these documents, determining their proper text, etc., etc., but in going outside of them we are turning away from the light instead of assisting in the illumination.

Anyone can see that this general position immensely narrows the range of the writer's field and detracts, at least in one point of view, from the value of his contribution. It has its—one might almost say—ridiculous side, as in the case of chronology where the biblical contributions to Hebrew chronology are interpreted for themselves and a scheme drawn up without regard to the Assyrian synchronisms. On the other hand, the writer's attention to the specific material in hand is intensified and a constant endeavor is made to understand and interpret the words and underlying ideas of the Hebrew sources, especially as the outgrowth of the specifically Old Testament religious spirit.

The result—sufficiently curious—is that Professor Klostermann's best work is done on that part of the Old Testament history which is least historical. He has contributed practically nothing to the understanding of the times from David to the exile. But his discussion of the primitive period, the patriarchal age, and the times of Moses is original and stimulating. He begins with the earliest ages, since the Old Testament historical material began there, or, to put it in another way, the consciousness of the Old Testament church carried it back to the beginning. The creative week he regards as the result of reflection; the stories of Adam and the pre-deluvians as the working

over—or, to use his suggestive word, *rebirth*—of non-Israelite traditions. The purpose of the narratives was to set all this primitive past in the light of the religious knowledge of Israel. The stories of the patriarchs constitute a well-arranged sermon, presenting them as models of piety to Israel and as founders of its world-wide mission.

But, then, what is historical in this? Klostermann makes use of the argument, much favored nowadays, from the religious self-consciousness of Israel. Later Israel could not have had this consciousness of the religion of the patriarchs unless it had been founded on real tradition. The religion of the later generation was what it was because the patriarchs had the religion which was attributed to them. This is turning of the evolutionary argument against its supporters in a surprising fashion, but we fear that they will not regard it as convincing. It is one thing to maintain that a later stage of religious development requires a previous preparation, and quite another thing to prove that the previous stage is practically what later idealization of tradition makes it.

A very generous use is made of the physical side of the miraculous events of early Hebrew history. Electricity played a large part at Sinai. The drying up of the Jordan and the fall of Jericho's walls are connected with seismic disturbances at that time. The sun "seemed" to halt at the battle of Beth-horon. These positions illustrate the independent attitude which the writer takes. On the one hand, he maintains with vigor and unyielding consistency the view that the religious element and moral impulse in Israel were primary and fundamental. The religion preceded the national life. "Israel did not become a religious community only upon the destruction of its political organization, but the consciousness implanted in it by Moses of being the priestly body (*Gesinde*) of Jahwe is from the first the impelling agent in its forming itself into a firm political organization." The character of Jahwe in Israel was from the first moral. The physical element in his name, connected with the tempest, was early symbolized and spiritualized into the destruction of wrong and the restoration of purity and right. Hence, he is the God of hope, in whom the oppressed may trust. To the Mosaic community all this is summed up in the new interpretation of the name Jahwe, "I will be that I am," the one God of self-revelation. Human history becomes a development, guided by the true God.

GEORGE S. GOODSPED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.